/643 cont./

867 whom you really like. At first every chap will be so agreeable; later when he has married you, it turns out that he is crude or lazy or unbearable. Then you will have to suffer. So, consider before you decide!" Nelly added: "One must warn young girls and make them alert, otherwise they will thoughtlessly and prematurely say 'yes' to the first chap who comes along. Later when the young couple find they are unsuited to eath other, the elders among their relatives will suffer for it just as much as they themselves!" Likewise /644/ the young man is given a definite hint by his uncle to take as his bride only the girl with whom "he will live peaceably for the rest of his life."

584 That there is freedom in the first choice can also be deduced
586 from the right every woman has to run away from the husband who treats her badly or does not provide enough food for her. How could she be taken in again by her parents, which is generally done, if she had previously been actually sold? Her male relatives warn the husband and threaten to take back the mistreated wife. They would not dare do this if he had bought her for a price.

584 It very seldom happens that two young people become
578 united if there is a strained relationship or open hostility between their parents. If such a match should be developing, the parents of the boy and those of the girl make insulting, even threatening remarks against the other party within their own family hut in order to thwart their children's intentions. It may be that a preliminary inclination toward a marital union will sooner or later disappear under this influence. Out of respect for her own parents the girl will forego her heart's desire, and since she makes no fuss about this, her closest relatives will not interfere on her behalf.

584 Still more awkward is the exceptional case of a girl who is
736 an orphan and very much dependent on her uncle and aunt. The
604 latter, driven by stubbornness or ambition, insistently urge her to choose the chap they recommend. If the solitary girl is unable to resist adequately, she will finally accede to their urging. My informers emphasized that such a case was rare, and that the previous history of the case would become publicly known only if this forced marriage, so to speak, should, in an exceptional instance, be dissolved.

/644 cont./

584 593 It has also happened, as Sara recalled, that the two lovers decided to elope, that they renounced any kind of marriage celebration, and that they remained away from their parents until they no longer feared reproach. Even if a child should be subjected to threats, he would find sufficient support from close relatives against the inadmissible interference of parents, if only he does not become intimidated and stands his ground. It is the special duty of the uncle to help so that every young person who wishes to marry is permitted to make an absolutely free decision. In case the uncle's influence on the parents does not bring results, he can even influence public opinion against them if they restrict their child's freedom of choice. All opposition dissolves automatically when the young couple has a child to be cared for. Thus, a person who must fear the disapproval or resistance of parents toward a marriage elopes with his partner; once the couple is blessed with one or two children, no one can interfere or separate them.

[604] [626] [583]

587 /645/ A woman who becomes a man's second wife also has unrestricted freedom of choice. If she is a widow, she must sometimes be glad if a man will take her, whether she likes him or not, and she suppresses her own wishes without a murmur. Her position is more favorable if an older man, whose wife has perhaps become incapable of working, woos her. From the start she can then secure for herself certain rights and a favorable position in the family. In the great majority of polygamous marriages the two women are sisters (21); the second one to be taken by the man is

595

21. This custom may be verified in Bridges' (i):21 words: "When a man married more wives than one they were generally sisters, which fact tendered greatly to strengthen the family party" /cited in English/. Relationship by marriage as such does not constitute blood relationship, hence does not hinder marriage (p. 417).

thus frequently better situated in many respects than in a monogamous marriage.

/645 cont./
834 in the selection of a mate (23).

23. If we consider the prevalent ideas in the free selection of a mate, we realize the absolute similarity and unanimity between our Yamana and the Selk'nam (Vol. I, 321).

/646/ 5. The Duty of Marrying a Widow

587 Apparently the levirate which is in effect among the Yamana deprives the widow of her freedom. I have the distinct impression that the rules pertaining to this are at least as specific and as definitely observed as among the Selk'nam (Vol. I, 347). I learned the following details from Fred Lawrence and Calderon.

587 Every Indian is familiar with the obligation of taking his
●604 widowed sister-in-law, along with her children, into his hut (24).
736

24. Only Hahn (a):805 mentioned the levirate among the Yamana. We might also deduce it from the following words of Bridges: "Brothers often take their deceased brothers' wives" /cited in English/ (MM:III, 117;1869); we cannot deduce from these words, however, a real obligation, which actually exists. See footnote on page 418.

but it is emphasized much more definitely that he must care for his nephews and nieces; there is less insistence that he devote himself to the widow, whether or not she wishes to marry. If these half-orphaned children have no grandparents and their mother does not decide to marry another man, the uncle must take them into his own hut where he must care for them as though they were his own. Above all, their sustenance is to be guaranteed. The group as a whole takes care of their participation in the youth initiation which sooner or later becomes necessary. From now on the paternal uncle takes the place of his deceased brother for the still immature orphans in all matters pertaining

/646 cont./

587 to social life. Naturally, adult nephews and nieces who are
604 married are not under the guardianship of their uncle. If the de-
736 ceased has several brothers, these obligations fall upon the old-
est, but not infrequently a younger brother comes forward, espe-
cially if he has his eye on his widowed sister-in-law. At any
rate, the brothers come to an agreement, and usually the one
who wants to take advantage of the opportunity promptly and
boldly takes charge without interference by the others.

The eldest brother, as such, has a priority to his widowed sister-in-law. It is well known that brothers-in-law and sisters-in-law are not prevented from marrying. The duty of an unmarried brother-in-law to take the widow almost borders on coercion. Differences in age have nothing to do with it. The widow has a perfectly free choice, but she can hardly resist the pressure put upon her by her brother-in-law if some outsider does not court her. If the widow actually exercises her right and marries another man instead of her brother-in-law, the latter is not relieved of his care for the children. He has to take the nephews and nieces if the new stepfather does not care to rear them. He is then content to know that his sister-in-law is taken care of economically. His nephews and nieces, however, will always have strong support from their paternal uncle, since his obligation toward them never ceases.

587 /647/ A married brother-in-law adequately fulfills his duty toward his widowed sister-in-law if he helps her toward economic security. Marrying her depends partly on the consent of his own wife. If the widow wishes to marry another man or to remain unmarried with one of her children or with relatives of her deceased husband, he does not prevent her from doing so. Sometimes the
587 brother-in-law takes advantage of the favorable opportunity to
586 enter into a new marriage if he is not satisfied with his first wife. Whether or not the latter agrees, he brings the widowed sister-in-law into his hut, and the only thing usually achieved by it is that the other withdraws, which is what he intended. It is even regarded as legal that a married man leave his first wife and, in her stead, take his widowed sister-in-law into his hut. If their married life was not very happy, she, too, is usually very glad of the solution, and her relatives take her in with open arms. This duty of marrying a widow is practiced even in modern times.

587
736
595

/648 cont./
responsible for the fact that many husbands have a second wife, and that many younger men are married to an older widow who has brought him the children of her deceased husband.

6. Participation of the Relatives

584
●644 The paternal uncle, indáruwa, unmistakably occupies a privileged position regarding his nephews and nieces. This is clearly evident at the time of the death of his married brother, as well as during his nephew's courtship and marriage. In the above lines we have already given a few data on the position of other adults relative to the marital plans of young people.

Following the dictates of his own heart, the young lad goes courting and tries to win the girl who promises to fulfill all his desires. The young lovers meet as often as possible, and their mutual affection grows as time goes on. If there is no pressure of outside circumstances, they amuse themselves in their amorous play without thinking of marrying soon. In their innermost conviction they have long since decided that they wish to belong together for life, without, however, expressing this openly to each other. And why should they! For the time being, neither of them reveals his feelings and intentions to his own parents; "they are somewhat ashamed!" I was told. A male neighbor and a female friend finally get the boy and girl to speak by making intimate allusions.

After the clandestine meetings and the love affair that can no longer be concealed have lasted long enough for the adults, the paternal uncle, indáruwa, one day decides to approach the boy very directly: "You have been meeting this girl for some time now. I finally ought to talk to your father about it!" Or he says: "We cannot go on seeing you dally with your beloved much longer. I shall soon inform your father in case you want to marry her!" This and similar expressions state the wish of the older relative to help the boy attain his goal. The latter realizes it. He takes this opportunity and has his uncle put the proposition before his father. Sometimes, if a boy wishes to reach his goal

/648 cont./

584 quickly, he himself openly approaches his uncle with the request
604 that he tell the father of his heart's urgent desire. The uncle fulfills his mission without delay and without expressing any doubts or advising against it. If the boy has no indáruwa, his maternal uncle, íman, helps him. The girl takes the same steps with her maternal aunt as soon as she has learned from her lover that his mission /649/ is already on the way to his father. The aunt also does not remonstrate with her; in fact, if the girl has given her consent to a boy whom she also likes, she is even happy about the decision. She brings the news to the mother.

The parents are never directly informed by their own children of the latter's wish and plan to marry. It is partly veneration and partly modesty that seal their lips. The only legally justified
[582] decision or judgment that the parents can exercise is for them to prove and vouch for the fact that the two lovers are not related by blood. If this were actually the case, the marriage could not take place. With this point settled, the parents of the boy and of the girl discuss the plan of the couple with their respective relatives. Not infrequently the child is present and at the same time is given some advice. Finally, the uncle, as well as the aunt, insists that the parents give their final consent which they personally make known to the boy or the girl. The two lovers tell each other of the desired result.

584 The arrangement we have just described is generally made
604 within a few days. Naturally, the intention of the young people
626 is the topic of conversation in the whole neighborhood. After all, the planned marriage is to become known everywhere, and it is chiefly the uncle and aunt who consciously work toward this. Nelly told me that public opinion and the help of the community are to be won for the lovers, particularly if one of the pair of parents is opposed to their child's intention. Obviously this arrangement serves to assure freedom in the choice of a mate. In spite of all this, but very rarely, the stubbornness of one of the pair of parents or the selfishness of an uncle or aunt does not permit the desired union of the young people. In the first instance, neither the boy nor the girl dares confide in the uncle or aunt; in the other instance, the uncle and aunt misuse their authority, against which the lovers cannot summon the courage to seek help

/649 cont./

584 elsewhere. In the opinion of the majority, such abuses are re-
604 garded as unjust; hence the guilty ones -- they are aware of be-
626 ing such -- make a secret of the fact that they have interfered without permission. The relatives and the larger community are steadfastly and as a matter of course on the side of the lovers, provided always that blood relationship is excluded. To the extent that the general public knows of the marriage plans of the couple, it prepares steadfastly for the forthcoming marriage. Meanwhile the aunts and female neighbors approach the girl in friendly good-will and wish her all kinds of happiness for the future, making this dependent on the recently imparted advice and the earlier instructions on the occasion of the menarche. The boy is merely given additional earnest warnings in case his conduct requires it.

587 When a couple enters a second marriage, the /650/ formalities that apply to the first marriage are omitted. "They are simply no longer necessary," as Calderon emphasized. "The couple know very well that they need not let themselves be influenced by anyone in their decision!" In one way or another, however, the newly wedded couple tells those nearest them of their union, so that the public in general will soon learn of it.

584 Marriageable young people in olden times were in an in-
182 comparably more favorable position; each one, following the dictates of his heart, selected from many persons the one desired. For the last few decades marital conditions have been affected by a complete disintegration of the natural order. They do not offer even a slight guarantee that the Yamana will continue as a people. In fact, the fate of the Yamana is already sealed.

7. Obstacles to Marriage

582 The basic freedom in the selection of a mate does not eliminate the fact that there are some things taken for granted which prohibit marital union. All adults are well informed about them. In particular it is the duty of the parents under no circumstances to permit the marital union of their child with a related person (p. 416). A few introductory remarks will be given before we list the actual obstacles to marriage.

/662 cont./

591 his abilities. The young bride feels differently. Although she
593 has long been accustomed to all the work that now falls upon her, she at first neither feels nor understands the actual meaning and lifework of her marital state. Sometimes she is overcome by an irresistible feeling of loneliness which depresses her and makes her silent and sad. A young woman may tearfully long for her mother and her sisters. No wonder, then, that the newly married couple [514] will visit the family of the young wife at brief intervals, where she will be comforted and encouraged by her own mother. Each time, the old woman paints her daughter's face with delicate lines, so that her husband will love her more day by day. When finally the greatly desired first child arrives, this situation at once changes very much for the better, for now the young woman is occupied day and night, her activity is the happiest one for a woman, and in her arms she finally holds the symbolic expression of her husband's love.

It is sometimes a considerable sacrifice for the parents to have to part with their daughter, especially if they are old and are completely alone when their last child is taken from them. Their only hope is the prospect that the young couple will remain with them for a time or visit them often and that the son-in-law will perform all kinds of services for them. It is very different with the parents of the boy, who are happy that he is finally going to establish his own household with the girl of his choice (44).

> 44. Hyades (q):378 exaggerates the duration of this living together: "Usually the young husbands... live for a long time with the parents of their wives, to whom they render many services" /translated from French/.

They wish him all kinds of happiness and follow with interest the development of the new family, without interfering. The parents of both parties are well aware that henceforth it is no longer proper for them to bother their child too often and on
•604 account of trifles. Oddly enough, the paternal uncle, indáruwa, and the maternal aunt, yēxadábi (BD:645 writes yekadábi), have the privilege of instructing and admonishing the husband or the wife to an extent far exceeding the few concessions that ancient

/662 cont./

604 custom grants the real parents. If the young woman should have the misfortune of having to seek help against infractions or cruel treatment by her husband, she first turns to her blood brother and then to her uncle.

581 593 In principle, the couple are united in marriage for life. Their marriage is not only a union of hearts, but also a union of work for the welfare of themselves and their children. Each of the two partners is assigned particular duties by ancient custom; it alone decides if and when the dissolution of a marriage is permissible. Unfortunately, the modern age has also changed the [177] original /663/ form of marriage in families of today, so that it is only partly recognizable in its outward appearance; hence the information given by all the old people was particularly valuable to me.

1. Monogamy

114 595 In describing the marital arrangements and family customs of the Yamana, the critic is faced with a difficult problem. The reports of earlier observers are often quite inadequate and in part clearly colored. In particular, the statements Bridges made about our Indians are consistently unfavorable to them, and his conscious or unconscious intention to show them in an unfriendly light can probably not be denied. The older reports from his pen are in a disparaging and disdainful vein. Later he [illegible] enough feeling for justice to correct some of his grossest er[illegible]. Other travelers, however, in describing things which they did not directly understand, leaned on Bridges, and this was especially true in the case of arrangements dealing with marriage and the family. This is why there is so much agreement and similarity of opinion among the writers. I personally no longer found the genuine form of married life among the Yamana of earlier times to be a common condition and was obliged to rely on the reports of trustworthy people, such as old Alfredo, during my second visit to Tierra del Fuego. Since their opinions were well founded, they at any rate counteract many false, unsubstantiated contentions.

Many of the earlier travelers maintain that the Yamana condone polygamy, but one cannot clearly tell from their words whether

/689 cont./

586 drives away a young wife from her husband, even though she has children, which sometimes are taken by the father if he loves them, and otherwise by the mother" /cited in English/. Not even the children of the couple prevent a divorce if the woman is repeatedly in danger of being mistreated. She herself does not complain to her own husband, but suffers silently. One of her male [64] relatives, however, above all her uncle, goes to him and reminds him of his duty. If repeated admonitions are fruitless, he threatens to remove the wife. She finally runs away with the help and under the protection of her relatives.

586 She often urgently needs this protection because the disap-
579 pointed husband will not willingly give her up, but pursues her or
627 constantly threatens her. On December 20, 1875, Bridges wrote: "Hidugalahgoon came here with a wife, that had been the wife of a man who had been very violent to her. Her mother was her fellow wife. She has two children by her former husband. The young fellow seemed very fond of her, and she of him; he had many friends here whom he was diligent to move in his favour by descanting upon the cruelties of the man, he feared, to his wife... The Easterns soon came up, and clustered around Philip's dwelling, where Hidugalahgoon and his wife lived. They began speaking quietly, and becoming more excited, gradually became vociferous and beat the woman, and compelled her to return to her former husband. But she would not stay, and then took shelter with Stephen. Thence again she was forced to come, but she was determined to kill her child; several evenings there was turmoil over this matter, and once considerable fighting. I took up the matter, and stated God's holy will on the subject, but the woman was very obstinate and would not return. Her late husband then gave her up, but required some compensation, for he felt, in losing his young wife, he had lost much. Being consulted by Hidugalahgoon, I advised that he should, under the circumstances, give what he could to restore peace" /cited in English/ (MM:X, 80;1875) (100).

100. A few months previously, on July 30, 1875, he experienced another incident: "A young man, commonly called Tom Post, is son-in-law to a native of this place. Last autumn several disturbances took place here,

2: Cooper E-4 (no date) 1946 SH6 Yahgan SH6

591 after which they would usually go for good to the groom's kin. Thus, localized groups of kin tended to be paternal.

604 After marriage the husband's paternal uncle and the wife's maternal aunt took particular interest in them, superseding in large measure their respective parents. Children-in-law were expected to
606 look after their parents-in-law in sickness or other needs. Children-in-law observed a number of avoidances regarding their parents-in-law: greeting their parents-in-law, speaking to them or breaking in on their conversation with remarks, looking at them, and sitting down beside them were all taboo. When in the same hut with their parents-in-law, they turned their sides or backs on them. A year or so after marriage, the restrictions between daughter-in-law and mother-in-law were partly, but never wholly, relaxed; those between son-in-law and father-in-law lasted through life. On visits of the father-in-law to his daughter, he and his son-in-law communicated wishes and news through the daughter and wife or by indirect discourse.

562 The man was, in theory, considered the head of the family, with
593 authority to rule. Actually, his authority was very far from absolute, and the woman was largely her own mistress, particularly in such provinces of her own as child rearing, food gathering, and canoe managing. Some men domineered over their wives, but not a few husbands were under the thumbs of their spouses. Some husbands were cruel, but if so they ran afoul of the wife's kin. More generally, woman's position both in the family and in the community seemed a respected one, not that of a drudge, slave, or inferior being, and she enjoyed a fairly high degree of freedom and independence.

684 Adultery was disapproved by the *Yahgan* code, but apparently
837 the code suffered appreciable infringement in practice. Adultery on the wife's part was, if discovered, punished by the husband with sound beatings, very rarely with death. Public opinion disapproved of her behavior. Adultery on the husband's part also gave rise to domestic battles in which the husband sometimes suffered severe treatment at his offended wife's hands. Jealousy on the part of both husband and wife was common. Wife lending was absent. There
[548] was no professional prostitution; a woman, married or unmarried, of markedly loose character was looked down upon.

586 Separation and divorce were fairly frequent, but were not lightly resorted to. The most common cause appears to have been cruel treatment of the wife by the husband, though there were other causes such as marked laziness, negligence, or crabbedness on the part of the
[595] wife. In case the wife became incapacitated through illness or age, the man could, and, it seems, more commonly did, take to himself a second wife.